UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,444	07/09/2003	Harichandra Reddy Sannapa Reddy	5681-54400	9140

58467   7590   12/12/2007

MHKKG/SUN
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767

EXAMINER
WAI, ERIC CHARLES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2195	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>11/28/2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

    a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

    b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

        Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

    (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

    (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

    (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

    (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

        NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

    Claim(s) allowed: *None.*

    Claim(s) objected to: *None.*

    Claim(s) rejected: *1-51.*

    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: *None.*

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

    _____.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☒ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAM
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2

Continuation of 13. Other: 1.   Applicant argues:
"Kalyanavarathan clearly does not teach, prior to sending the request to the selected node, the load balancer determining if the selected node is able to service the request. In fact, Kalyanavarathan teaches just the opposite since Kalyanavarathan's load balancer does not make any such determination until after the request has been sent to the selected node."
2.   Examiner disagrees. In previous Office Action dated 09/28/2007, Examiner stated that Kalyanavarathan teaches the claimed subject matter based on subsequent requests. In Kalyanavarathan, an initial request is sent out. However, the steps as recited in claim 1 of Applicant's invention are performed for each successive request in Kalyanavarathan.

3.   Applicant argues:
"The request in claim 1 is the request for which the load balancer selects a node to handle the request from among a plurality of nodes. In contrast, the subsequent request referred to in Kalyanavarathan is a request pertaining to the same session for which a node has already been selected when the initial request was received. See col. 3, line 62 - col. 4, line 7. Thus, in Kalyanavarathan for the subsequent request the load balancer selection scheme is not used unless the already selected node is found to be inactive. Kalyanavarathan refers to this as "sticky" load balancing. Therefore, the subsequent request in Kalyanavarathan does not correspond to the request in claim 1 since the request in claim 1 is the request for which the node selection is performed by the load balancer when the node is not known to be inactive."
4.   Examiner disagrees. Although subsequent requests in Kalyanavarathan are related to the same session, they are still routed to the load balancer (Fig 2 step 208). The manner in which the load balancer selects a node is not clearly stated in Applicant's claimed invention. Kalyanavarathan use of "sticky" load balancing is still load balancing which reads on the claimed subject matter. .